

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA
4

5 GABRIELLA SULLIVAN, et al.,)
6 Plaintiffs,) 3:22-cv-5403-DGE
7 v.) Tacoma, Washington
8) September 23, 2022
9 BOB FURGUSON, et al.,)
10 Defendants.) Motion Hearing
11) 2:00 p.m.

12 VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID G. ESTUDILLO
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Proceedings stenographically reported and transcribed
25 With computer-aided technology

APPEARANCES

For the Plaintiffs: JOEL B. ARD
Ard Law Group
P.O. Box 11633
Bainbridge Island, Washington

WILLIAM BERGSTROM
PETER A. PATTERSON
Cooper & Kirk
1523 New Hampshire Avenue NW
Washington, DC

For the Defendants
Ferguson and
Batiste: ANDREW R.W. HUGHES
Attorney General's Office
800 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2000
Seattle, Washington 98104-3188

For the Defendants
Satterberg and
Cole-Tindall: ANN MARIE SUMMERS
DAVID J.W. HACKETT
King County Prosecutor's Office
1191 Second Avenue
Suite 1700
Seattle, Washington

For the Defendants
Gese and Enright: CHRISTINE M. PALMER
Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office
614 Division Street
MS-35A
Port Orchard, Washington

For the Defendants
Scott and Tillotson: CALLIE A. CASTILLO
Lane Powell
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4200
Seattle, Washington

For the Proposed
Intervener Defendant
Alliance for Gun
Responsibility: ZACHARY J. PEKELIS
Pacifica Law Group LLP
1191 Second Avenue
Suite 2000
Seattle, Washington

AFTERN00N SESSION

SEPTEMBER 23, 2022

THE CLERK: We are ready to go on the record when you are.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Let's go ahead and go on the record.

THE CLERK: This is Sullivan, et al. versus Ferguson, et al., CV-22-5403-DGE.

Counsel for plaintiff, please make an appearance.

MR. PATTERSON: Pete Patterson from Cooper & Kirk for plaintiff. My colleague Will Bergstrom is here today. He will be doing the speaking for us.

MR. BERGSTROM: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: I think I heard Mr. Ard is here as well?

MR. ARD: Yes, Joel Ard. I will go back on mute and let Mr. Bergstrom do the speaking.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE CLERK: For defendants.

MR. HUGHES: Assistant Attorney General Andrew Hughes here on behalf of Defendants Ferguson and Chief Batiste.

MS. SUMMERS: I am Ann Summers here with my colleague David Hackett on behalf of Defendants Prosecutor Dan Satterberg and Sheriff Cole-Tindall.

MS. PALMER: Christy Palmer, prosecuting attorney for Kitsap County. I am here for Defendants John Gese and

1 Chad Enright.

2 MS. CASTILLO: Callie Castillo on behalf of
3 Defendants Norma Tillotson and Rick Scott of Grays Harbor.

4 MR. PEKELIS: Zach Pekelis for Proposed Intervener
5 Defendant Alliance for Gun Responsibility.

6 THE COURT: I apologize, I am taking a bit of time
7 and writing down names. For my purposes, I have the State
8 being represented by Mr. Hughes, King County by Ms. Summers,
9 Kitsap County by Ms. Palmer, and then Grays Harbor by
10 Ms. Castillo; is that correct? Yes, okay. Perfect. And
11 then today speaking on behalf of plaintiff will be
12 Mr. Bergstrom?

13 MR. BERGSTROM: Yes.

14 THE COURT: And then on behalf of proposed
15 intervener, is Mr. --

16 MR. PEKELIS: Zach Pekelis on behalf of the Alliance
17 for Gun Responsibility.

18 THE COURT: I am going to put "Alliance," just
19 because it is easier.

20 Good afternoon. My name is David Estudillo. I am the
21 District Judge assigned to this case. I appreciate you being
22 here to discuss the case and the status.

23 I do understand there are three motions currently pending.
24 One is the motion for intervener Alliance. The other two
25 being the motion to dismiss from Kitsap County and one from

1 King County. Those are on my list of things to get to.

2 Unfortunately, as you hopefully may appreciate, and maybe
3 you don't, but you might appreciate that I only came on less
4 than a year ago. When you get transferred on or come on
5 board, you are given a docket with a number of motions that
6 are already pending. As you are trying to get out of the
7 motions that are pending, motions are filed in new cases
8 being assigned to you. It takes a little time.

9 I have been digging myself out of my work that I was
10 already assigned as soon as I got here. Obviously, that
11 means I have to give and take at certain spots. That's why
12 it has been a little bit slower on this case to get to the
13 three pending motions. They are on my radar. I do hope to
14 dedicate time to focus on them on a sooner-than-later basis.
15 I will say it is difficult to give you an official timeline
16 when I will get a response or orders out on those matters.
17 Rest assured, they are on the radar and they will be
18 addressed on a sooner-than-later basis.

19 With that said, there are a couple things we need to
20 discuss. First is the issue of discovery. I know the
21 parties have a dispute as to whether or not to engage in
22 discovery. Currently, there is no motion before me for a
23 formal motion to stay discovery. Just so that we are all
24 clear, there is nothing currently staying discovery. I do
25 want to hear from the parties more about their motion on the

1 need for discovery and/or the reason not to engage in
2 discovery. I am not sure who wants to go first.

3 I think plaintiff, of course, indicates no discovery is
4 needed, and I am not sure who officially did the complete
5 response from the defense side. The State defendants
6 indicate that some discovery is required.

7 From the plaintiff's side, any comments you want to make?
8 I have read your position. Anything you think the Court
9 should focus on on that issue at this point?

10 MR. BERGSTROM: No. I'll be very brief. I would
11 highlight the *Bruen* test is new. It is fairly clear what
12 matters and what doesn't here. The sort of facts that matter
13 to the merits of this case are not the facts found in
14 discovery. Things that are known facts about the laws and
15 about the historical tradition, that is something we think we
16 don't need discovery on.

17 The other two issues the State raises are damages and
18 plaintiffs' standing. We don't think -- again, the
19 plaintiffs' standing, we don't think facts that go to
20 standing in this case are really in dispute here. We don't
21 think discovery is necessary on those either.

22 Rainier Arms is a dealer. They have stopped selling these
23 magazines because of the ban. Our two individual plaintiffs
24 cannot purchase them and are not purchasing them because of
25 the ban. We don't think discovery would be fruitful on

1 those.

2 Regarding damages, I would say quickly, we said in our
3 submission that we were planning on amending the Complaint.
4 We have discussed it some more. I think we could stipulate
5 away damages. Either way, we are not seeking damages in this
6 case. We think discovery on that point is also unnecessary.

7 THE COURT: Thank you. Let me ask you a brief
8 question about the legislative facts or historical context.
9 What do you envision presenting to the Court in your motion
10 in support for plaintiff's position on why this history, the
11 legislative facts support a finding of the current
12 regulations in violation of the Second Amendment? What would
13 you be presenting? Some case law? Specific statutes? Are
14 you going to give me a summary of what you believe the
15 history incorporates, and who is going to present that
16 summary of the history?

17 MR. BERGSTROM: Good question. First, I would say
18 under *Bruen* the burden is actually on the defendants to
19 present that history, to prove their law is constitutional
20 under that history.

21 We would intend to rely on publicly available sources:
22 historical statutes, Law Review articles, things of that
23 nature to present that history.

24 THE COURT: Let me hear from the defense side, the
25 State defendants.

1 MR. HUGHES: This is, in our view, a pretty
2 extraordinary request. If you look at *Bruen*, it is primarily
3 a 133-page discussion of history. It is not just statutes
4 and firearm laws. There is also the historical context in
5 which those laws arise. For example, there is a long
6 discussion in the opinion, which is just one example, of
7 surety laws. The court goes back and forth on whether or not
8 there was enough evidence in the record of whether the surety
9 laws actually burdened plaintiff's Second -- someone's Second
10 Amendment right to carry weapons. The court referenced one
11 particular Law Review article that "canvassed" -- was the
12 word they used -- 19th Century newspapers. That's the sort
13 of historical work that under the *Bruen* test and the history
14 test we need to do. We need to do it through expert
15 historians who are specially trained, have the ability to
16 look at archives, find archival material that Mr. Bergstrom
17 references, statutes and the like, put that in historical
18 context.

19 I note that plaintiffs' Complaint relied primarily on an
20 article from a lawyer who argues that there is all sorts of
21 these examples of large-capacity weapons that have been in
22 common use since time in memorial. Our historians have to
23 look at those. What they are going to show, not to look at
24 the merits, but whether or not those weapons are actually
25 being used, whether there actually is a tradition of use of

1 large-capacity magazines against which there was no
2 regulation, and whether under *Bruen* it may be inappropriate
3 to regulate now is a historical question that is going to
4 require some significant expertise and significant time to
5 develop a record.

6 On the point of standing, plaintiff says there is
7 presently no dispute on whether these plaintiffs have
8 standing. Of course, we haven't taken discovery on that.
9 That's the reason why there is no dispute. Arguing that the
10 lack of a present dispute means there should be no discovery
11 is sort of circular.

12 Unless Your Honor has any questions, I'll leave it at
13 that.

14 THE COURT: I don't.

15 Did any of the other defendants or interveners have any
16 comments on this issue?

17 MS. SUMMERS: This is Ann Summers with King County.
18 I would add the *Jones vs Bonta* case, which is involving the
19 California law regarding large-capacity magazines, the Ninth
20 Circuit, a few weeks ago, remanded that to district court. I
21 think that is a strong signal as far as the Ninth Circuit is
22 concerned that fact finding is required on the district court
23 level. If fact finding is required, I think discovery is
24 appropriate. It is not a question of things the Court can
25 take judicial notice of.

1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else?
2 Mr. Pekelis.

3 MR. PEKELIS: Zach Pekelis on behalf of the proposed
4 intervener. I agree fully with what Mr. Hughes and
5 Ms. Summers said. I point out just to kind of tether to the
6 *Bruen* decision that it is not just that the Court is to look
7 at the historical context, but what does the Court do with
8 the historical context.

9 What the *Bruen* court instructed in several cases is
10 whether "modern and historical regulations impose a
11 comparable burden on the right of armed self-defense."
12 Whether that burden is comparably justified are central
13 considerations when engaging in an analogical inquiry. It is
14 not that you look at the history. You look at the modern law
15 and examine whether the benefits and burdens of the modern
16 law that is challenged are comparable to the historical
17 analogue benefits and burdens. That's the classic type of
18 question on which discovery would be most helpful and indeed
19 necessary.

20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

21 First, as I indicated just briefly at the beginning, there
22 is no real motion in front of me to stay discovery. There is
23 currently nothing that stops discovery.

24 Having reviewed the issue, I will give you my general
25 thoughts and then you could always decide if you really want

1 to file the motion. I am going to give you what I think is
2 going to happen if you file the motion.

3 First, this is an issue many courts are dealing with
4 because most judges -- there might be some that are outliers
5 that are truly historians in their prior life or experiences,
6 but most judges are not historians. We are trained to
7 research case law, do an analysis, provide our analytical
8 thinking as to what the issue may be, et cetera. We are not
9 true historians, we are just not. Quite frankly, chambers
10 staff that assists the judges, we don't hire historians
11 either. They are usually individuals that are researchers
12 when it comes to case law and have good analytical skills and
13 writing skills.

14 It really puts courts just in a very difficult position to
15 analyze what the history is because that's not our
16 background, quite frankly.

17 This *Bruen* decision definitely is new. In my mind, it is
18 really putting an emphasis on historical context. I am going
19 to note one of the things it said right at the beginning as
20 we talked about *Heller* and what was being done in *Heller* and,
21 of course, they use that kind of analysis I think throughout
22 the rest of the decision. In reference to *Heller*, they are
23 noting that in assessing the post-ratification history --
24 they are referring to the Second Amendment -- we look to four
25 different types of sources.

1 First, we reviewed how the founding era legal scholars
2 interpreted the Second Amendment in published writing.
3 Second, we looked to the 19th Century cases that interpret
4 the Second Amendment and found they universally support an
5 individual's right to keep and bear arms. Third, we examined
6 the discussion of the Second Amendment in Congress and in
7 public discourse after the support as people debated whether
8 and how to secure the constitutional rights for newly freed
9 slaves, and we considered how post-Civil War commentators
10 understood the rights. It was truly, from what I could tell,
11 historical research done by historians. In essence, what
12 they were looking towards.

13 I will also point out -- let's see here -- what
14 Mr. Pekelis noted, and in addition to the quote that
15 Mr. Pekelis stated, after that the Supreme Court stated: "To
16 be clear, analogical reasoning under the Second Amendment is
17 neither a regulatory straightjacket nor a regulatory blank
18 check. On the one hand, courts should not 'uphold every
19 modern law that remotely resembles a historical analogue'
20 because doing so 'risks endorsing outliers that our ancestors
21 would never have accepted.' On the other hand, analogical
22 reasoning requires only that the government identify a
23 well-established and representative historical analogue, not
24 a historical twin. So even if the modern-day regulation is
25 not a dead ringer for historical precursors, it still may be

1 analogous enough to pass constitutional muster."

2 Given that, I think there does need to be some type of
3 discovery in finding out what historians on those issues that
4 I just kind of referenced, what historians would opine on
5 some of those things, what they find in their research. So
6 it is very difficult for me to say, hey, there should be no
7 discovery on any of this.

8 Mr. Bergstrom, you and your colleague are welcome, if you
9 wish, to file a formal motion on this. Maybe I am completely
10 wrong. Maybe you point to some other reasoning in the
11 decision that somehow says no, you can just make decisions
12 without any further discovery.

13 Based on what I am reading right now, I don't think I
14 would agree with that. Again, you might be able to convince
15 me otherwise based on what you find, what you point to in the
16 language of the decision. Right now, seems like it is
17 probably not likely, to be honest, that I would agree with
18 you.

19 Things can change, and I might change my mind if you point
20 to something that is very convincing. Right now, it doesn't
21 seem to be there.

22 I think discovery does need to be had, some form of
23 discovery, to help the Court out with the historical contexts
24 of some of these issues. That is my general thoughts with
25 regard to discovery.

1 Likewise, same thing with the standing issue. Too early
2 for me to say. On the one hand, plaintiffs say, you know,
3 there is a real dispute here. The representative plaintiffs
4 are no longer able to sell these magazines. Likewise, the
5 other plaintiffs are not allowed to buy them, et cetera.
6 Arguably, there is standing. Again, I haven't reviewed this
7 completely. There might be some discovery that says
8 otherwise. It is kind of hard to give you my thoughts as to
9 what I would do without further seeing a motion on that
10 issue.

11 The bottom line is, there is no stay at this point.
12 Because there is no stay, right now discovery is open. I
13 will leave it to the parties if they want to file a formal
14 motion, as I indicated, for the Court to consider it a bit
15 further. It is going forward at this point absent an order
16 from the Court that enters a stay. That is presently not an
17 order the Court has entered.

18 Okay. That is my thoughts on some of those issues. The
19 other purpose for these status hearings, in addition to
20 talking about some of these issues and identifying the trial
21 dates, I want to make sure we have proper expectations. One
22 of the things I do in most of my case -- this is a unique
23 case and more complicated than some of the ones we deal with.
24 I want to go on with my normal comments which is, first,
25 focus on professionalism and civility. I have no doubt that

1 everybody is professional and everybody is civil. And when
2 people interact by telephone, video, or in person, usually
3 individuals get along quite well and are very civil with each
4 other.

5 I just ask you be mindful that when you write, you check
6 before you hit the "send" button in an email or before you
7 pop the letter in the mail, just make sure how you express
8 yourself in some of those communications is appropriate.
9 Because as you all know, if you feel that you are offended by
10 somebody else's writing or vice versa, that just leads to a
11 bad relationship and leads to a bad litigation experience.
12 Although there are strong feelings on these issues, we should
13 be able to be civil and talk about the issues in a civil
14 manner and make decisions in a civil manner. Just be mindful
15 before you send something, double check it. Just double
16 check it so you are certain not to be using language that
17 might be offensive to the other side.

18 Make sure you follow the civil rules. Make sure you know
19 the civil rules as well as the local court rules. Sometimes
20 individuals are not paying attention to those. I want to
21 make sure you focus and know the rules.

22 We do plan on issuing a case schedule at this point. We
23 will identify a trial date here shortly. I am going to
24 expect the parties follow the case schedule and meet the
25 deadlines. That means if the deadline says an expert

1 disclosure date of X, that is the date when the disclosure
2 should occur, absent some type of extreme issue that comes up
3 that maybe the parties were not aware of, somebody is ill,
4 some particular personal issue with a family member so they
5 just weren't able to get to the issue. Other than that, the
6 parties should be aware deadlines will be enforced.

7 Make sure you submit discovery in a timely fashion. If
8 you are not satisfied with the responses, make sure you take
9 steps to actually enforce the discovery that is being -- has
10 not been responded to or not appropriately responded to in
11 your mind. Don't wait a couple of months before deciding,
12 oh, I think I am going to try to enforce my discovery request
13 because that just causes delay for everyone all around.

14 Expert disclosures, make sure you appropriately disclose
15 opinions. I don't expect it in this case. Sometimes we get
16 expert disclosures where there is a whole lot of verbiage
17 with not much really said. Make sure you appropriately
18 disclose expert opinions and, of course, the basis for their
19 opinions. I am not expecting that to be an issue in this
20 case, given the context of the issues we are dealing with,
21 but be aware of that.

22 When you disclose your expert opinions, any rebuttal
23 opinions, if you haven't disclosed an initial expert, make
24 sure you identify their available dates for depositions at
25 the outset. Don't wait for the other side to request a date

1 for the deposition. If you wait, inevitably people's
2 schedules get busy and all of a sudden I am getting a joint
3 motion that says, "We need more time to complete the
4 deposition of the plaintiffs' expert and we jointly submit a
5 request to extend the deadline for discovery," at which point
6 you will get an order that says, "Denied." Basically, "See
7 the case schedule." That will be the response.

8 I say that and, you know, obviously again there is always
9 emergency situations that we will take under consideration.
10 The reality is if you are going to ask for an extension, you
11 need to support it. When I say "support it," really support
12 it. Give me something that says, "We had a personal issue to
13 deal with and therefore we couldn't comply." Or, "I had
14 another case scheduled three weeks ago and we went to trial."
15 That's not sufficient, quite frankly, because everybody has
16 those type of issues. It is just not sufficient.

17 I do believe I have authority in the Ninth Circuit to
18 enforce case schedules. This is from *Wong vs Regence of*
19 *University of California*, 410 F.3d, 1052 at 1060, a Ninth
20 Circuit 2005 case: "In these days of heavy caseloads, trial
21 courts in both the federal and state systems routinely set
22 schedules and establish deadlines to foster the efficient
23 treatment and resolution of cases. Those efforts will be
24 successful only if the deadlines are taken seriously by the
25 parties. The best way to encourage that is to enforce the

1 deadlines. Parties must understand they will pay a price for
2 failure to comply strictly with scheduling and other orders.
3 Failure to do so may properly support severe sanctions and
4 exclusions of evidence."

5 Until the Ninth Circuit dings me on a case on why I don't
6 extend the deadline and tells me why I did it wrong, my
7 thought process at this point is I am going to run with this
8 language and enforce the deadlines. Be aware that you should
9 expect the deadlines not to be extended.

10 Discovery disputes. I don't want the parties filing an
11 actual motion for a discovery dispute until after we had a
12 status hearing on what the dispute might be. More often than
13 not, I find in a status conference we can either at least
14 narrow the issues down so I am not getting 30 pages worth of
15 documents on non-issues and that really there was only one
16 issue we had to deal with, or we hopefully can resolve the
17 issue during the status hearing.

18 Usually what I do is I tell you, well, this is what I
19 think I will do if you were to file a motion, and then the
20 parties can figure out whether they want to spend time to
21 file a motion knowing what the Court may likely do.

22 In preparation, though, for the status hearing on a
23 discovery issue, you will need to submit a joint summary of
24 what the dispute is; just one document from all parties.
25 What I want is literally a bullet point summary. Issue

1 No. 1, whatever the issue of dispute may be, followed by
2 plaintiffs' position, followed by defendant State's position,
3 followed by all the other parties that are still in the case
4 at that point's position.

5 It needs to be summarized, bullet points. If you believe
6 there is a case on point, give me the case name and cite.
7 You don't need to elaborate. I will go and read the case in
8 preparation for the hearing and determine in my opinion if it
9 applies or not. It literally is a bullet point summary of
10 what the dispute is, what the basis for each party's position
11 is. It should be no more than three pages.

12 If you file something that is ten pages, we are going to
13 say no, get it down to a very simple three-page summary of
14 what it is we are talking about. If we need to take more
15 time during the status hearing to explain it better, we will
16 take the time to explain it better. I want the summary
17 because it is just easier to have the summary and talk about
18 the issues.

19 That, of course, requires that you actually confer on what
20 the dispute is. Of course, you'll have to meet by telephone,
21 video or in person and work together to actually summarize
22 each party's position into that joint summary. After you
23 file the joint summary with the Court, you can then contact
24 the courtroom deputy to schedule the status hearing. We are
25 pretty prompt. We are pretty prompt on getting a date for

1 discussing the discovery disputes. Also depends on your
2 calendars, but we are fairly prompt because we want to get
3 the disputes out of the way as soon as possible and/or have
4 you file a formal motion if you can't resolve it during a
5 status hearing.

6 Which leads to the point of, if we can't resolve the
7 dispute during the status hearing, I will ask for a formal
8 motion at that point in time and we will decide if we need to
9 issue a formal order, of course, at that point on the
10 discovery issue.

11 Any questions about that procedure or any other comments I
12 have made thus far?

13 Based on what the parties have identified, what we are
14 looking at as far as an available trial date based on
15 everybody's schedule is November 6, 2023. We would have, in
16 essence, expert witness disclosures due by April 1st, 2023,
17 any rebuttal witness disclosures by April 30th, 2023,
18 dispositive motion deadline would be July 10, 2023, discovery
19 deadline June 9th, 2023. Those would be the major dates.

20 There is more information in our scheduling order. Those
21 are the major dates we would be identifying.

22 Basic question, I guess maybe this is more for the defense
23 side because they are the ones that say they are planning on
24 using an expert and possibly the plaintiff may as well
25 afterward. For now, it looks like the defense has indicated

1 this. April 1, 2023, is that enough time for you to get your
2 defense experts ready to go and with actual opinions? If it
3 is not, you need to tell me now so we can build in enough
4 time. I don't want a motion coming back saying "my expert
5 needs more time." That's just going to be denied, unless you
6 tell me now. Is that appropriate or not?

7 MR. HUGHES: Understood. As you know, discovery is
8 like a handbag, we will fill as much as you give us. We have
9 been hearing six to nine months. That would be a little less
10 than seven months out. I think if we could push that to
11 April 30th as the discovery deadline.

12 THE COURT: The disclosure deadline?

13 MR. HUGHES: I misspoke. If we could push the
14 disclosure deadline to April 30th, I could tell you with real
15 confidence there wouldn't be any issues on our side.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Bergstrom, comments from you? I know
17 you indicated initially you didn't think from the plaintiffs'
18 side there was a need for experts. Do you think you would
19 likely, given everything you have heard today, try to go out
20 and look for an expert?

21 MR. BERGSTROM: It is possible. I can't say with any
22 certainty right now until we see what sort of expert is put
23 forward whether we think we need anything to respond. We
24 think usually these can be responded to just with legal
25 argument. We would assess that when we saw their reports.

1 THE COURT: I think what I am going to do is I am
2 going to build in a little bit more time. That is going to
3 move the trial date. I am moving the trial date because I
4 want to make sure I have enough time to review the
5 dispositive motions, quite frankly. These are going to be
6 complicated. These are not going to be the normal motions.
7 I am going to need time in order to review them and hopefully
8 issue a ruling. Then depending on what the ruling is, I want
9 to make sure I build in enough time for pretrial stuff. I
10 don't want the parties working on pretrial stuff until after
11 I had time to issue dispositive rulings to narrow the issue
12 down, depending on what the result is, and we will figure it
13 out at that point.

14 I am going to ask Gretchen, my courtroom deputy, if we are
15 looking at a disclose -- initial expert disclosure date of
16 April 30th, May 1, whatever it is, what would be an available
17 trial date after that?

18 THE CLERK: I am here. You said initial expert
19 disclosure date of?

20 THE COURT: April 30th. I am bumping everything 30
21 days. After November 6, 30 days after that, if we have
22 availability. If not, we go to the next year.

23 THE CLERK: You have December 4th and December 11th
24 of 2023 available.

25 THE COURT: Let's go with December 4th.

1 THE CLERK: Okay.

2 THE COURT: That would bump everything approximately
3 30 days. Not quite April 30th. Maybe like April 28 when you
4 calculate, whatever the date it spits out.

5 Will that work, Mr. Hughes? You have to tell me now. I
6 am telling you, you come back and say, "My expert needs more
7 time," you are going to get a "no."

8 MR. HUGHES: We can make that work, Your Honor.
9 Thank you so much.

10 THE COURT: We will issue a corresponding order that
11 identifies the trial date of December 4th. All the dates
12 will correspond to that afterward.

13 I think that is all I have to discuss. Is -- oh, I know.
14 I forgot. There is another case that has possibly some
15 similar arguments being made. What's the status? Is this
16 something the parties foresee might need to be consolidated
17 one way or the other somehow, because obviously I don't think
18 we want two different rulings from the different courts in
19 our own state, but maybe I am wrong. Any thought of -- are
20 the same plaintiff attorneys involved in that one or
21 different plaintiff attorneys?

22 MR. BERGSTROM: Different plaintiff attorneys,
23 Your Honor. At this point, we don't think consolidation is
24 necessary. The State may have a better idea of where that is
25 at procedurally. I will let him speak to that. The

1 plaintiffs' position is we don't need to consolidate at this
2 point.

3 MR. HUGHES: I will accept the invitation,
4 Your Honor. That case was filed shortly after this one. It
5 is in a similar posture. No discovery has been taken yet.
6 We have not yet -- we have answered the Complaint. We
7 haven't had the scheduling conference. Plaintiff has
8 informed us he intends to file a motion for preliminary
9 injunction and intends that to be heard in November of 2022.
10 That is the status as far as I can tell you. I have no
11 position on consolidation at this point. I also --

12 THE COURT: It raises my flag. Okay. Just keep them
13 in mind. We are going to keep it in mind as well. If the
14 parties think they are similar enough, maybe they should be
15 at some point. I don't know the answer. I am throwing it
16 out there because it was listed. All right. Just want to
17 throw that out there.

18 Any issues that any of the parties feel need to be
19 identified or at least something else that maybe I didn't
20 discuss or touch upon that we should point out at this point
21 for everybody to be aware of?

22 MR. BERGSTROM: Nothing from plaintiff.

23 MR. HUGHES: Nothing from State defendants,
24 Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. As I indicated

1 with regard to the current motions on behalf of King County,
2 Kitsap and Intervener Alliance, they are on my priority list.
3 I do hope to get to them on a sooner-than-later basis, but I
4 can't give you a date right now unfortunately.

5 All right. Thank you. Have a good rest of your
6 afternoon. I appreciate you all being here and hopefully you
7 can enjoy the rest of your weekend.

8 MR. BERGSTROM: Thank you.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 (The proceedings adjourned.)

11
12
13 C E R T I F I C A T E
14
15

16 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
17 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
18
19
20

21 */s/ Angela Nicolavo*

22 ANGELA NICOLAVO
23 COURT REPORTER
24
25